DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 346 708 FL 018 111

AUTHOR Holmberg, Borje
TITLE Distance Teaching of Modern Languages.
INSTITUTION Fern Univ., Hagen (Germany). Inst. for Research into Distance Education.
PUB DATE Jul 89
NOTE 52p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Course Content; *Distance Education; Educational Assessment; Educational Objectives; Foreign Countries; Intonation; Language of Instruction; Language Skills; Linguistic Theory; *Program Design; Pronunciation; *Second Language Instruction; Surveys; *Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

A study of distance teaching of modern languages in institutions around the world is reported. An introductory section provides an overview of the status and role of distance education in modern language learning, including an examination of related linguistic and educational theory, the objectives of distance language instruction, the behaviorist and cognitive approaches, and a number of classroom instruction issues, such as teaching pronunciation, use of the native language in class, contrastive and direct language teaching methods, and the learning of oral skills at a distance. A worldwide survey concerning the provision of distance language instruction is described and summarized. Institutions surveyed were asked about: institutional characteristics; course offerings; language course goals and content; the language skills targeted; the preferred instructional approaches (inductive vs. deductive); the preferred method of teacher-student correspondence; instruction in pronunciation, stress, and intonation; and the instructional techniques used. Conclusions are drawn regarding current thinking and practice in distance language instruction. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED346208

FernUniversität
The Distance Teaching University of the
Federal Republic of Germany

Z I F F
Zentrales Institut für Fernstudienforschung
The Institute for Research into Distance Education

Distance Teaching of Modern Languages

Börje Holmberg

Hagen: July 1989

FL018111

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Holmberg, B

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ZIFF-Project: Language Teaching at a Distance

Project leaders:

Prof. Dr., Dr. h.c., Dr. h.c. Börje Holmberg

Members of the team:

Daniela Klintz
Dr. phil. Rudolf Schuemer

Zentrales Institut für Fernstudienforschung (ZIFF)
FernUniversität - Gesamthochschule -
Postfach 940
D-5800 Hagen 1
Federal Republic of Germany

(c) FernUniversität - Gesamthochschule -: Hagen, July 1989

Contents

PART I: Distance Teaching of Modern Languages - An Overview

(Börje Holmberg)

PART II: The survey results: Short summary of data.

(Börje Holmberg & Rudolf Schuemer,
assisted by Daniela Klintz)

PART III: Conclusions

(Börje Holmberg)

Appendix I: The Questionnaire

Appendix II: Cross-tabs: 'Teaching level' x Q1-Q9

PART I:

Distance Teaching of Modern Languages – An overview

Börje Holmberg

Distance teaching of modern languages - an overview

Teaching and learning a modern foreign language by distance-education methods, i.e. without teacher und learner meeting face to face[1], has been practised since the end of the 19th century (cf. Gaddén 1973 pp. 24 - 33, 40, 60 - 66, Holmberg 1986 p. 10). Correspondence courses, almost from the beginning sometimes supplemented by audio recordings (on Hermods' phonograph cylinders made of wax from the first decade of this century see Gaddén 1973 p. 61), have been used for the teaching of a great number of languages, among them English, French, German, Italian, Russian and Spanish. No tenable reason why any language should be considered unsuitable for distance teaching and learning can be found[2]. There is much evidence of the effectiveness of distance teaching of foreign languages (Boyesen 1964, Gaddén 1973, Abrioux 1982, Stinger 1982), although speech and conversation proficiency is assumed to require face-to-face exercises.

Behind all attempts to teach and otherwise facilitate the learning of a modern language there are inevitably theoretical considerations. They concern language theory, the attempted study goals (communication skills or capacity to read and appreciate literary texts, for example), the view of the learner (a thinking person or a mechanistic executor of skills) and of the teaching organisation (as a guide and supporter or as a stand-in for a drill sergeant), epistemological principles (preference for inductive or deductive approaches) etc.

Language theory

Some concerns of this kind touch on basic principles of language theory. Thus Ferdinand de Saussure's distinction between la langue and la parole of the turn of the century (Fowler 1974 p. 24) makes for clarity as to what is meant by language as a study object. Whereas la langue represents a code or system, la parole is the language used in a particular situation. Noam Chomsky's latter-day designations of these concepts are linguistic competence and performance (cf. Fowler 1974). Are we primarily interested in the former so that we can deduct conclusions about individual applications or in the latter in the hope of learning inductively?[3]

The problem that many linguists have paid attention to during the last couple of decades is whether our cognitive structure is from the beginning receptive of a kind of general grammar that can be considered a common human inheritance. An indication that this can be so is that all normal children very quickly pick up highly complex comparable grammars. Our ability to generalise imformation and make hypotheses is related to (includes) this disposition. This is an assumption on which Noam Chomsky bases his generative transformational grammar. He submits that the differing systems of individual languages are surface reflexes of one and the same deep structure. Chomsky assumes that

> 'knowledge of language - a grammar - can be acquired only by an organism that is "preset" with a severe restriction on the form of grammar. This innate restriction is a precondition, in the Kantian sense, for lingustic experience, and it appears to be the critical factor in determining the course and result of language learning.'
>
> (Chomsky 1972 p. 91)

Chomsky's approach has attracted much attention. One of his interpreters, Jerold Katz, writes that he

> 'conceives of language acquisiton as a process of implicit theory construction similar in character to theory construction in science but without the explicit intellectual operations of the latter. According to Chomsky's conception, the child formulates hypotheses about the rules of the linguistic description of the language whose sentences he is hearing, derives predictions from such hypotheses about the linguistic structure of sentences he will hear in the future, checks these predictions against the new sentences he encounters, eliminates those hypotheses that are contrary to the evidence, and evaluates those that are not eliminated by a simplicity principle which selects the simplest as the best hypothesis concerning the rules underlying the sentences he has heard and will hear. This process of hypothesis construction, verification, and evaluation repeats itself until the child matures past the point where the language acquisition device operates.'
>
> (Katz 1966 p. 275)

In hypothesising, the child is limited to a grammar of 'a predetermined form' (Chomsky 1972 p. 91). Cf. Chomsky 1964.

These and a number of other considerations relevant to applied linguistics must inevitably concern distance teaching of modern foreign languages. Positions in relation to theory of this kind are either explicitly taken as guidelines for the teaching or are implicitly adopted (understood as 'natural' or taken over from national or other traditions in the field of language teaching).

Educational theory

Theoretical approaches of immediate relevance to distance education irrespective of subject area taught and learned must be considered along with theories of language. The focus here is on the very communication process that is at the heart of education. This includes, as I have shown elsewhere (Holmberg 1985 p. 27, e.g.), both real and simulated communication. While the former is brought about by correspondence, telephone interaction or by the use of audio cassettes, computers and in other ways, the latter is dependent on the style of presentation which may have the character of a conversation. This implies, inter alia, an easily

accessible presentation of study matter, somewhat colloquial language, moderate density of information and attempts to involve the student emotionally so that he or she takes a personal interest in the subject and its problems. A personal style including the use of the personal and possessive pronouns I and my, you, our etc. belongs here. On conversation theories applicable to distance education see Forsythe 1986 and Holmberg, Schuemer & Obermeier 1982.

What I call didactic conversation calls forth an empathy approach which is no less important and no less practicable in the real communication process (cf. Rekkedal 1985). Further aspects of real communication, its forms, media and frequency (cf. Holmberg 1985 Chapter 4) are equally relevant to distance education, and so are a number of general educational theories.

It is against this background of linguistic and educational theories that distance teaching and learning of foreign languages must be considered.

Learning aims

Languages are taught and learned for different purposes. While in some cases the capacity to read texts of an academic or professional type is the chief aim of the study, the overall goal is in other cases the capacity to speak with some fluency, to write correctly, or to read and appreciate literary texts, poetry and drama etc. In the interest of general education the order of priority is usually 1) reading and understanding, 2) listening and understanding, 3) speaking and 4) writing.

These goals are very general. To be useful as practical guides for content selection and methodology they must be analysed so that more specified objectives can be catered for. Does, for instance, the capacity to write French imply translation into French or free writing of, say, essays, reports, letters?

Behaviourist and cognitivist approaches

How to decide on and implement broad goals and detailed objectives of teaching and learning has been extensively discussed also from the points of view of distance education. Some educators of the behaviourist school, influenced particularly by R.F. Mager's methods for 'preparing instructional objectives' and the taxonomies of Bloom and Kratwohl (Mager 1957, Bloom et al 1956 and 1964), have insisted that objectives expressed in behavioural terms should guide all course development. This means that the objectives must specify what a student should be able to do after the study. Definitions of learning objectives are expected to avoid verbs of state like know, understand, realise, grasp, master as these are ambiguous. Verbal expressions of action like recognise the symtom of, explain by means of synonyms or a sentence, translate, conduct experiment, demonstrate, do, enumerate, calculate, quote arguments for and against, prove,

write an account of, report orally on are examples of expressions found more acceptable in definitions of objectives.

While this technique can be useful in many contexts its value is limited. For a discussion of this for distance education in general see Macdonald-Ross 1973, for example.

Behavioural thinking is based on the stimulus-response theory. This implies that in teaching and learning certain stimuli cause foreseeable reactions or responses. The responses rather than what the student thinks or feels are considered important as indicators of learning. Feed-back, re-inforcing correct replies is used to consolidate learning. Reinforcement correlated with the response, not with the stimulus, was stressed by B.F. Skinner, perhaps the most influental behaviourist (cf. Bower & Hilgard 1981 p. 171).

In language teaching behavioural thinking has some important methodological implications. It causes rather mechanistic exercises in reproducing the foreign language, so-called pattern drill, without explanations of contrasts between the student's mother tongue and the foreign language or any principle applied. Thus, instead of explicitly informing students of the facts that the French object forms of the personal pronouns me, te, se, nous, vous, precede le, la, les, which in their turn precede lui and leur, a doctrinaire behaviourist would merely consistently expose the student to the correct usage and make him/her imitate and repeat:

Il m'a donné le livre. Il me l'a donné.
Je vais lui donner le livre. Je vais le lui donner.

Students may then be asked to answer questions like
A-t-il leur parlé? (Oui, il leur a parlé
Non, il ne leur a pas parlé)

or to change a positive sentence into a negative one:

Ils leur ont parlé. (Ils ne leur ont pas parlé)
Prêtez lui le livre. (Ne le lui prêtez pas).

In the same way students of German can be exposed to sentences like the following ones without being made to consider the principles that govern the use of haben and sein as auxiliaries:

Ich habe gut geschlafen	-	Ich bin schnell eingeschlafen
Ich habe ein Buch gelesen	-	Ich bin krank geworden
Ich habe die Vase auf den Tisch gestellt	-	Ich bin sofort zurückgefahren

One theory is that after a sufficient number of reading and listening, speaking and writing exercises the student will automatically express himself/herself correctly within the limits of the patterns thus practised. Paradoxically enough, Chomsky's argumentation, which entirely rejects behaviourism, could also be referred to as support of pattern drill if each step in language

learning is considered an hypothesis, an interim grammar. This is, of course, what happens when children learn their mother tongue. They produce increasingly correct sentences as they reject the implicit hypotheses on which they have based earlier ungrammatical sentences.

If educators believe that a second language can be learnt in the same way - in the case of most distance education: if they believe that adults can learn a language in the same way and that it is a practical method - they will refrain from references to logics, grammar, the mother tongue and discussion generally. However, no such method for adult learning or for the study of foreign languages generally has been found useful in organised teaching and learning:

> A method for teaching foreign languages that could justifiably claim to be based on first language acquisition would have to meet at least the following requirements:
>
> 1. That it would allow the learner to progress by forming a series of increasingly complete hypotheses about the language.
>
> 2. That, consequently, it would permit, and indeed encourage, the learner to produce sentences that are ungrammatical interims of full native competence, in order to test these hypotheses.
>
> 3. That it would emphasise the perception of patterns rather than the intensity of practice.
>
> 4. That its teaching techniques would include partial repetition of sentences, verbal play, and situationally appropriate expansions of the learner's sentences.
>
> No method can at present claim to fulfill these requirements. It remains to be seen whether they can in principle be fulfilled, whether in fact, the analogy between first and second language learning is sound (Cook 1969 pp. 215 - 216)

The very considerable time required for consistent application to the learning of a foreign language of the procedures used by child for the learning of the first language is evidently a strong argument against such a method.

However, this does not mean that pattern drill is avoided in language learning as an adult-education subject. Pattern drill lends itself easily to application in distance education, both in writing and on audio tape. In the latter case (cf. the latter part of the French example given above) the question or instruction is recorded and so is, after a pause, the correct reply, which provides 'feedback'. The student is expected to use the pause for

recording his/her reply.

It is evident that exercises of this kind are useful. The question is if it would not be helpful to explain the underlying principles before the exercises start, thus making them more of an intellectual endeavour than a mechanistic skill activity. Doing this would imply using what is called a cognitivist approach instead of the behaviourist one[4]. Empirical studies have shown that, indeed, this cognitive approach is superior to the merely behaviourist technique (Lindell 1971, Smith & Berger 1968) in that the achievements of the students are better and their attitudes to the study more favourable than those resulting from mere pattern drill.

In any study of distance teaching of foreign modern languages it is thus of interest to find out if and how pattern drill is practised. Are the exercises used on the basis of explanations and understanding or merely as training of mechanistic skills?

Inductivism vs deductivism

Behaviourism in teaching and learning is per definitionem an inductive approach whereas cognitivism in education is basically deductive (cf. Ausubel's derivative and correlative subsumption; Ausubel 1968 p. 100 ff). Sometimes in language teaching it seems difficult to make a clear distinction between inductivism and deductivism.

The following would seem to be a frequently practised way of teaching grammatical structures in German:

1. A presentation of typical sentences selected from a text read from which the student infers what principles govern the usage (like 'Ich gab ihnen die Bücher. Gab er euch die Bücher? Er gab ihr den Ring. Ich sah sie auf der Straße. Sie bat ihn um Hilfe. Schickte er Ihnen keine Blumen?')

2. A discussion of the findings made specifying the principles illustrated, explaining, e.g., why the dative form is used after the verb in five of the sentences and the accusative form in the other two. This can be done in a Socratic way referring to the students' observations.

3. Exercises of a self-checking character.

4. A discussion of the exercises, relating the individual examples to the general principle discovered according to 1 and 2.

5. New, more complicated examples.

6. A discussion of the findings.

7. New self-checking exercises.

8. A discussion of the new exercises relating the to the principle as explained under 2 and 6.

Is this an inductive, 'bottom-up' approach or a deductive, 'top-down' presentation? The procedure suggested is open to alternative interpretations. Superficially it would seem to represent a typical application of the inductive method: particulars (case forms) are looked for and identified, and from these findings conclusions are drawn about general principles. Nevertheless, it would on the other hand be possible to interpret the initial analysis of sentences as an introduction to the general insight that in German there are case forms of articles and pronouns related to logical syntax. On the basis of this general approach, particular forms are identified and learnt.

This is, in fact, a philosophical controversy, to which, as far as it seems immediately relevant to distance education, I have given some attention elsewhere (Holmberg 1978 pp. 3 - 5, 1985 p. 53 f). How this dilemma is handled in practice is a matter not devoid of interest.

Teaching pronunciation

A similar although in some respects very different controversy bearing on a methodological problem concerns the way pronunciation is taught. Imitation is here a sine qua non, but is it enough? The way many languages are pronounced by non-natives even after many years of practice indicates that it is not. The 'ear' and imitative capacity of most people are simply not good enough. In Closset's "Didactique des langues vivantes" this is stressed as follows:

> L'opinion courante, suivant laquelle l'assimilation des sons étrangers pourrait se faire par l'imitation pure, repose sur une méconnaissance totale de la tâche difficile de l'enseignement des langues vivantes et de ses exigences les plus urgentes. Apprend-on à jouer du violon en regardant jouer un violoniste? Or le jeu des organes phonateurs est bien plus rapide, bien plus complexe. - Remarquons en outre que le nombre des élevés de type auditif est, dans une classe, fort peu élevé.
>
> (quoted from Thorén 1957 p. 92)

The truth of this can be confirmed by any teacher of English. Many students who have listened to and consciously tried to imitate British English for years do not distinguish between walk and work in their speech, pronounce camp as though it rhymed with hemp, and are still heard to pronounce an [r] of some kind in words like more and forty, which, although good Scottish and American English, is definitely not RP[5]. Also lacking ability to distinguish between [-eit] and [-it] in words like moderate support Closset's conclusions. In the last-mentioned case lack of insight into the relations of spelling and pronunciation (-ate = [it] at the end of nouns and adjectives, [eit] at the end of

verbs) is to be blamed, whereas in the other cases it is the acoustic perception and the articulation that are deficient. Exact descriptions of sounds, phonetic transcription coupled with recorded speech (students listening to audio cassettes, imitating and comparing) would seem to be the answer. How is a French student to learn how to pronounce the English [i] in him, sit etc. if he/she is not made aware of the difference between this sound and its equivalent in French, which by English standards is very tense indeed? Without explicit explanations many students mispronounce words like occurred and entered [ə'kə:d] and ['entəd][6]. For clarity here, phonetic transcription seems indispensable, which is not necessarily the case in the teaching and learning of all other languages.

Most distance educators are aware of these difficulties and apply solutions of various kinds in their pre-produced courses and in the ensuing non-contiguous communication. Apart from phonetic transcription the use of audio recordings both for listening and for interaction, i.e. communication between students and tutors, contributes to good results, also with respect to stress and intonation, particularly when combined with or based on explanations giving students insight into the rules behind the usage. The telephone is useful for interaction generally, but is deficient for some pronunciation exercises. It may, for example, be difficult to distinguish between [s] and [z] on the telephone.

The use of the mother tongue

When communicative rather than reading skills are the most important learning objectives, the use of the mother tongue in the teaching-learning situation is usually limited in favour of the foreign language that is being studied. While this makes sense in everyday use of the language, it hardly does so when grammatical or phonetical subjects are discussed. The educator must ask himself/herself if the vocabulary required for this kind of discussion is sufficiently important to the student or if terminology of little interest to the non-linguist is required. If not, the mother tongue as the teaching medium is the evident choice.

Most situations and contexts and many words can easily be explained in the foreign language. In such cases translations are not necessary although many students feel more secure if such translations are available. However, there are a number of cases in which translations are required because explanations can be misleading or not sufficiently exact. Thus it makes little sense to avoid translations of names of animals or plants, as evident from some examples actually occurring in textbooks (and quoted by Lindell): lily simply described as 'white flower' (Lindell adds: 'from daisy to orchid!') and: 'A shark is a very big fish. A herring is a small fish; a cod is rather big' (Lindell 1970 p. 76). It is certainly doubtful if students realise from these descriptions what flowers and what fishes are meant. What common practice in distance education is like in this respect would seem to be worth while finding out.

Contrastive and 'direct' methods

Germane to the problem areas so far discussed is the question of contrastive analyses of the foreign language in relation to the mother tongue. Extreme protagonists of the so-called direct method find all references to the mother tongue objectionable as obstacles to the learning of the foreign language, whereas others insist that to bring about exactitude and student security explanations of the language mechanism are necessary and that for such explanations comparisons with the mother tongue are necessary. Cf. James 1969, who illustrates the need for contrastive analysis by the following examples of the indicative and the subjunctive in Spanish:

> Ha coleccionado mariposas que tienen alas rojas.
> He's collected butterflies with (which have) red wings.
>
> Busca mariposas que tengan alas rojas.
> He's looking for butterflies which have (with) red wings.
>
> (quoted from Malmberg 1971 p. 120)

Most educators probably find contrastive discussion required in a number of cases, thus, e.g., when English-speaking students are to learn German expressions like 'Er hätte es tun sollen' (= He should have done it).

Speech

It is difficult to see how the ability to converse in a foreign language can be learnt without practice in conversation. Telephone conversations seem to offer the sole solution here if nothing but non-contiguous communication is possible. Speech in the sense of speech making, giving lectures etc. can, of course, be practised and commented on on audio tape. Nevertheless, for most speech training it is difficult to do without face-to-face practice, which, however, need not be part of a course but can also be provided in other ways (private meetings, on the job etc.) even though then there is usually little feedback as to the correctness of the learner's speech.

Conclusion

The above concerns play important parts in most attempts to develop language learning at a distance. A number of further problems could well have been added to those referred to. Nevertheless those briefly discussed above seem to be of particular importance. They concern basic issues related to language, general education and distance teaching and learning. A study of practice in the respects discussed is called for. These considerations have caused a questionnaire study of practice in distance-education, on which a report is given in the following presentation.

F O O T N O T E S

1 The term distance education covers the various forms of study at all levels which are not under the continuous, immediate supervision of tutors present with their students in lecture rooms or on the same premises, but which, nevertheless, benefit from the planning, guidance and tuition of a tutorial organisation. This definition of mine (Holmberg 1977 p. 9) has been widely accepted (cf. Keegan 1980 whose propositions have been analysed by Bååth 1981). Distance study denotes the activity of the students, distance teaching that of the tutorial organisation, particularly its authors and tutors. Cf. Holmberg 1985 p. 1

2 The fact that in Australia non-European languages have been found to cause special difficulties (in language teaching generally) is, of course, no argument to the contrary. Cf. Bowden, Starrs & Quinn 1987 pp. 22 - 23.

3 From the point of view of linguistic research the question must be worded somewhat differently. To Saussure la langue, the general system, is of prime interest. Louis Hjelmslev follows up the Saussure approach. He insists on 'a deductive method, not an inductive one, and thus derives the linguistic structure from a number of a-priori theoretical premisses'. Hjelmslev's approach, 'glossematics', is generative in the sense that the rules defined make it possible to create any length and any number of statements ("texts") in the language in question. They thus constitute a calculation leading to prediction ... (Malmberg 1971 p. 21). On generative grammar cf. Chomsky 1957. A generative grammar of English 'is one that contains a list of symbols ... and a list of rules for combining these symbols in various ways to produce every English sentence' (Thomas 1965 p. 8).

4 'The stimulus-response theorist and the cognitive theorist come up with different answers to the question: What is learned? The answer of the former is "habits"; the answer of the latter is "cognitive structures" or "factual knowledge"' (Bower & Hilgard p. 15).

5 RP = Received Pronunciation, a kind of standard English propagated by upper and upper-middle class tradition in England. Cf. Gimson 1962 p. 83.

6 The simple rule is that the verb ending -ed is pronounced [d] after voiced sounds except [d], where it is pronounced [id], [t] after voiceless sounds except [t], where it is [id]. Thus played [pleid], filled [fild], stopped [stɔpt], but handed ['hændid], limited ['limitid]. As occur and enter are pronounced [ə'kə:] and ['entə], the ending -ed follows a vowel (a voiced sound) in these words, thus [d].

PART II:

The survey results: Short summary of data

Börje Holmberg & Rudolf Schuemer

assisted by

Daniela Klintz

The survey results: Short summary of data

This part gives a short descriptive summary of the data. See the conclusions in part III for discussion of the results.

1 The Questionnaire

The survey was done by a written questionnaire which was developed by B. Holmberg (see Appendix I); its main subjects/topics are:

- kind of distance teaching institution (Q-II)[1)]
- number of (language) courses (Q-III)
- educational level of the institution (Q-IV) and of the language courses (Q-V)
- goals of the language courses (Q1, Q2)
- content items of the courses (Q3)
- skills to be trained by exercises and assignments (Q4, Q5)
- language teaching approaches: inductive/deductive (Q6)
- style of the courses: like letters/like handbooks (Q7)
- teaching pronunciation, stress and intonation (Q8)
- use of pattern drill (Q10, Q11, Q12)
- methods of introduction of new words (Q13)
- non-contiguous communication between 'learner' and 'organisation'; assignments (Q14-Q16)
- communication media (Q17)
- conversation exercises (Q18)
- (in)dispensability of face-to-face elements in language teaching (Q19, Q20).

2 The sample (dispatch and response rates)

The dispatch of the questionnaires was made in two steps
a) the first dispatch to 988 addresses: in July 1988
b) the second dispatch of the questionannire with a reminding letter to those who did not answer: in November 1988

The number of addresses and of responses are summarized in Table 1 (showing also the regional distribution).

---

1) The roman and arabic numbers (preceded by 'Q') refer to the question numbers of the questionnaire - see Appendix I.

Table 1: Dispatch and response rate: Regional distribution over continents/political regions

a) dispatch/number of addresses
b) number of institutions responding
c) number of institutions filling in one or more questionnaires
d) number of questionnaires filled in
e) number of institutions not offering language teaching

Region	a)	b)	c)	d)	e)	Rate: (b/a)*100
Australia	57	20	11	14	9	35.1
Asia	117	25	21	22	4	21.4
Africa	64	13	8	8	5	20.3
Latin America (incl. the Caribbean)	125	24	9	9	15	19.2
Northern America (USA+Canada)	204	88	53	54	35	43.1
Western Europe (incl. Scandinavia)	332	103	55	55	48	31.0
Eastern Europe (Socialist countries)	89	9	4	5	5	10.1
Total	988	282	161	167	121	28.5

The questionnaire was sent to 988 institutions, 282 (≈28.5%) of which responded: 161 filled in one or more questionnaires[2)] and 121 wrote that they do not offer any language course by distance teaching.

The overall response rate of 28.5% is similarly low as in other international surveys of distance education (cf. Graff & Holmberg 1985, 1988, e.g.)

The estimated rate of 57.1% (161 out of 282) distance-teaching institutions offering also language courses is somewhat higher than the 37.2% (42 from 113) reported in an earlier study (Schuemer in Graff & Holmberg 1988, p. 17).

2) 4 of the 161 institutions sent more than one questionnaire; these 4 institutions are greater universities with different departments offering language courses: University of New England, Australia (4); Massey Univ., New Zealand (2), Univ. A. Mickiewicza, Poland (2), and Old Dominion Univ., USA (2). (The numbers in brackets are the numbers of questionnaires filled in by the institution.)

With regard to the regional distribution it can be seen from Table 1 that the response rate is highest (43.1%) for Northern America and lowest for Eastern Europe (10.1%).

Because of the low overall response rate as well as because of the uneven regional distribution the representativity of the survey is doubtful. Therefore, any generalisation with regard to the 'population' of all distance-teaching institutions must be regarded with some reservations (strictly speaking, the results are valid only for the sample of respondents).

The results (frequencies of responses) are listed below on the base of N=167 responses (including the multiple responses of the 4 institutions mentioned above). Only with regard to Q-II (kind of institution), Q-III (number of courses), Q-IV (educational level of institution), and Q-V (language-teaching level) both frequencies - those <u>including</u> the multiple responses (f_{mr}) and those <u>excluding</u> multiple responses (f_i) - will be given.

3 Frequencies of responses

3.1 Kind of distance-education institution (Q-II)

Table 2: Kind of distance-education institution (Q-II)

f_{mr}: frequency for each category including the multiple responses from 4 institutions (N=167)
f_i : frequency for each category excluding multiple responses* (N=161)

	f_{mr}	f_i
- a correspondence school	54	54
- a school teaching both face to face and at a distance	30	30
- a publishing house also offering distance-education courses	5	5
- a broadcasting organisation	9	9
- a distance-teaching university	16	15
- a university teaching both face to face and at a distance	69	64
- other	17	17

* selecting one questionnaire at random for each of the 4 institutions with multiple responses

Universities (64+15) and correspondence schools (54+30) are nearly equally frequent in the sample.

3.2 Number of courses (Q-III)

Table 3: Number of courses (Q-III)

a) total number of courses offered in distance education only

Median: 60 (66)* first quartile (Q_1): 10 (10) third quartile (Q_3): 150 (150)

b) number of language courses in distance education only

Median: 4-5 (5) first quartile (Q_1): 1-2 (1-2) third quartile (Q_3): 12 (12)

* in brackets: after excluding multiple responses

The number of language courses offered by each institution varies considerably between the institutions; the median number of language courses per institution is rather low (between 4 and 5).

3.3 Educational level of the intitutions (Q-IV) and language teaching level (Q-V)

The category most frequently mentioned at Q-IV (92 x) is 'university study' (cf. Q-II) followed by 'further education at school' (55 x) and 'basic school education' (46 x). The distribution for the 'language teaching level' (Q-V see Table 5) corresponds to the distribution for the overall educational level just described.

Table 4: Educational level of institutions (Q-IV)

f_{mr}: frequency for each category including the multiple responses from 4 institutions (N=167)
f_i : frequency for each category excluding multiple responses (N=161)

	f_{mr}	f_i
- basic school education (primary and secondary level up to 15/16)	46	46
- further education at school (e.g. preparation of 'A levels', high school certificate and qualification for university studies, upper secondary level)	55	55
- university study, upper college level	98	92
- basic vocational training	34	34
- further vocational training (after basic vocational training and/or job experience)	32	32
- other	17	17

Table 5: Language-teaching level (Q-V)

f_{mr}, f_i : see Table 4

	f_{mr}	f_i
- courses for beginners/primary-school level or equivalent for adults	54	53
- secondary school level	67	66
- university study of language	80	75
- language for occupational use	44	44
- other	21	21

For the following questions (Q1 - Q19) the frequencies are based on all responses (N=167; including the multiple questionnaires from the 4 institutions mentioned above).

3.4 The goals of language courses (Q1/Q2)

Table 6: Goals of language courses (Q1/Q2)

f: frequency of mentioning (Q1)
f_{R1}: frequency of rank '1' (Q2)

	f	f_{R1}
- developing skills in reading and understanding	152	75
- developing skills in listening and understanding	127	28
- developing skills in writing	138	28
- developing skills in speaking	120	29
- orienting students in the culture/s/ the language represents	101	6
- promoting literary appreciation	75	2
- promoting factual knowledge of literature	54	1
- promoting knowledge about linguistics	35	1
- other	15	0
(1 x 'no answer')		

The goals most frequently mentioned are:
- developing skills in reading and understanding (152 x)
- developing skills in writing (138 x)
- developing skills in listening and understanding (127 x)
- developing skills in speaking (120 x)

Obviously, the goals are not interpreted as being mutually exclusive. The numbers of goals ticked off by each respondent show that the great majority of them think that their courses pursue more than one goal: Only 11 respondents ticked off only 1 goal; 66 (≈40%) ticked off 4 or less goals; but 100 respondents ticked off 5 or more goals (Median: between 4 and 5; first quartil Q1: between 3 and 4; third quartil Q3: ≈6).

The respondents had the opportunity to rank the goals according to their importance (Q2; rank of '1' for the most important goal);

the goals with the highest frequency of mentioning listed above are also those with the greatest frequency of ranks between '1' and '3'; 'developing skills in reading and understanding' is the goal with the highest frequency of rank '1' (75 x).

3.5 Content items (Q3)

Table 7: Content items (Q3)

f: frequency of mentioning

	f
- contents prescribed in school or university curricula	103
- modern everyday usage	138
- narrative prose - extract from novels, e.g.	88
- descriptive prose - as in reports of various kinds	72
- argumentative prose - as in debates and polemics	42
- poetry	63
- drama	55
- spoken dialogue	114
- letter writing	81
- translation from the foreign language	110
- translation into the foreign language	99
- selected principles of grammar	105
- systematic grammar	96
- principles of pronunciation, stress and intonation	113
- systematic phonetics	33
- cultural orientation	104
(1 x 'no answer')	

Q3 refers to the content items of the language courses. The items most frequently mentioned are:

- modern everyday usage (138 x)
- spoken dialogue (114 x)
- principles of pronunciation, stress and intonation (113 x)
- translation from the foreign language (110 x)
- selected principles of grammar (105 x)
- cultural orientation (104 x)

Obviously, the courses include several content items: only 5 (≈3%) of the respondents ticked off only one item; 104 say that their courses include 7 or more content items (Median: ≈8; Q1: ≈5; Q3: ≈10).

3.6 Skills trained by exercises... (Q4/Q5)

Table 8: skills trained by exercises... (Q4/Q5)

f: frequency of mentioning (Q4)
f_{R1}: frequency of rank '1' (Q5)

	f	f_{R1}
- oral fluency	95	30
- grammatical accuracy	145	38
- free writing	88	11
- correct pronunciation	102	8
- interpretation of literary texts	65	4
- understanding of the contexts of texts read	123	39
- vocabulary	145	18
- correct translation from the foreign language	105	19
- correct translation into the foreign language	98	10
- use of idioms typical of the language being studied	111	3
(2 x 'no answer')		

'Skills trained' most frequently mentioned are:
- vocabulary (145)
- grammatical accuracy (145)
- the understanding of the contexts of text read (123)
- use of idioms... (111)

The skills ranked '1' most frequently by the respondents are:
- understanding of the contexts...(39)
- grammatical accuracy (38)
- oral fluency (30)

Also with regard to Q4 the majoritiy of respondents marked more than 1 skill to be trained by exercises; only 6 ticked off 2 skills or less and 132 ticked off 5 or more (Median: ≈6; Q1: between 4 and 5; Q3: ≈8).

3.7 Preferred approach in teaching the foreign language/s (Q6)

Table 9: Preferred approach in teaching the foreign language/s (Q6)

f: frequency of mentioning

	f
- inductive approach (by making students observe characteristics of the language, making generalisations and infer rules from observation made)	20
- deductive approach (teaching rules, from which students can deduct usage)	25
- combination of inductive and deductive approaches	121
(4 x 'no answer')	

The great majority of the institutions prefer combining inductive and deductive approaches in language teaching.

3.8 Preferred style (Q7)

Table 10: Preferred style (Q7)

	f
- like personal letters (referring to the student as 'you', e.g.)	101
- like handbooks	59
(9 x 'no answer')	

About two third of the institutions use the style of personal letters rather that that of handbooks in their teaching (cf. Holmberg's concept of the 'guided didactic conversation in distance teaching' - Holmberg et al 1982).

3.9 Teaching pronunciation, stress and intonation (Q8)

Table 11: Teaching pronunciation, stress and intonation (Q8) by

	f
- descriptions in writing	46
- use of phonetic transcription combined with descriptions	43
- recordings on audio tape/cassette	104
- a systematic combination of all these approaches	65
(7 x 'no answer')	

The majoritiy of institutions use recordings (audio tape/cassette) to teach pronunciation, stress and intonation; and a great number of institutions use the recordings in combination with other methods (like 'phonetic transcriptions', e.g.).

3.10 Use of contrastive method (Q9)

Table 12: Use of contrastive method (Q9)

	f
'yes'	104
'no'	48
'no answer'	15

The 'contrastive method' relating the usage in the foreign language to that in the mother tongue is widely used.

3.11 Pattern drill (Q10, Q11) and pattern exercises (Q12)

Table 13: Use of pattern drill (Q10)

	f
'yes'	123
'no'	34
'no answer'	10

'Pattern drill' is used by the great majority of institutions (Q10). The principles governing the usage are mostly explained in advance (Q11a).

Table 14: Methods of pattern drill (Q11a, b, c)

a) explanation of the principles governing the usage in detail in advance:	
'yes'	89
'no'	16
'no answer'	62
b) explanation of the principles governing the usage in connenction with or after exercise:	
'yes'	55
'no'	13
'no answer'	99
c) no explanation of the principles governing the usage; relying on imitation and refraining from theoretical explanations:	
'yes'	13
'no'	55
'no answer'	99

'Pattern exercises' are performed in writing as well as on audio cassettes; the written form is used more frequently than the oral one (Q12).

Table 15: Pattern exercises (Q12)

n.a. frequency of 'not applicable' or 'no answer'

	yes	no	n.a.
- performed in writing	114	11	42
- on audio cassettes/tapes	76	21	70

3.12 Introduction of new words (Q13)

Table 16: Introduction of new words (Q13) by:

	yes	no	no answer
- providing translations of new words	74	32	61
- replacing translations by explanations in the foreign language	37	33	97
- use of both procedures	88	13	66

New words are introduced more often by 'providing translations' than by 'replacing translations by explanations in the foreign language' although the majoritiy of institutions use a combination of both procedures (Q13).

3.13 Non-contiguous communication (Q14)

Table 17: Non-contiguous communication (Q14)

	yes	no	no answer
communication between the students and the organisation primarily based on assignments for submission	139	19	9

The non-contiguous communication is based mainly on assignments for submission (Q14); the assignments often include exercises on pronunciation, stress and intonation (Q15).

3.14 Inclusion of questions on pronunciation within the assignments (Q15)

Table 18: Do the assignments include questions on pronunciation, stress, and intonation? (Q15)

'yes'	78
'no'	58
'no answer'	31

3.15 Communication forms/media (Q17)

Table 19: Communication forms/media (Q17)	
Students communicate with the organisation:	f
- in writing	159
- on the telephone	104
- on audio cassettes/tapes	68
- by computer	9
(2 x 'no answer')	

'Writing' is the most commonly used form of communication between the learner and the teaching organisation although the telephone or audio cassettes/tapes are often mentioned (Q17); the total number of responses to this question (summed over the categories) is about twice the number of institutions - indicating that most institutions use more than one medium/form of communication.

3.16 Inclusion of conversation exercises (Q18)

Table 20: Inclusion of conversation exercises (Q18)	
- yes	95
- no	66
- no answer	6

The courses of the majoritiy of the institutions include conversation exercises (Q18) - cf. Q1 and Q3: 'developing skills in speaking' is a frequently mentioned goal and 'spoken dialogue' a freqently mentioned content item.

3.17 Face-to-face elements in language teaching (Q19)

Table 21: Can learning of modern languages at a distance be satisfactory without any elements of face-to-face teaching? (Q19)	
- yes	92
- no	65
- no answer	10

Although the majority of respondents (92 x) think that learning of modern languages can be satisfactory without any element of face-to-face teaching there seems to be some doubt about this.

4 Cross-tabulation of 'language-teaching level' versus Q1 -- Q19

The responses to questions Q1 -- Q19 can be differentiated according to the teaching level of the language courses (Q-V). The levels in Q-V can be divided into two broader categories: 'level'=1 'university level' versus 'level'=0 'other level' (If sub-item 3 of Q-V 'university study of language' is ticked off, then 'level'=1; else 'level'=0).

The relationships between this 'level' classification and the responses to questions Q1 -- Q19 can be studied by means of cross-tabulation; in these cross-tabs the two categories of 'level' and the response categories of each (sub)item of Q1--Q19 are crossed. The 2 x 2 tables of these cross-tabs ('level' vs. each of the sub-items of Q1 -- Q19) are not presented here in detail (cf. Appendix 2); instead a short summary of some of these relations is given below.

4.1 'Level' and 'goals' of the language courses (Q1)

If the language courses have 'university-study level' ('level'=1), then there is a stronger tendency[3] to pursue the following goals (sub-items of Q1)

- 'developing skills in writing' (Q1U3: phi=.14; p=.06).
- 'orienting students in the culture/s/ the language represents' (Q1U5: phi=.17; p=.02).
- 'promoting literary appreciation' (Q1U6: phi=.25; p=.001).
- 'promoting factual knowledge of literature' although this correlation is weak (Q1U7: phi=.11; p=.10)
- 'promoting knowledge about linguistics' (Q1U8: phi=.19; p=.01).

4.2 'Level' and 'content items' of courses (Q3)

If the courses have 'university study level', then the following content items are more often mentioned

- 'contents prescribed in school or university curricula' (Q3U1: phi=.28; p=.001)
- 'narrative prose - extracts from novels, e.g.' (Q3U3: phi=.18; p=.01).
- 'poetry', although this correlation is weak (Q3U6: phi=.14; p=.06)
- 'drama' (Q3U7: phi=.27; p=.001)

---

3) 'stronger tendency' means that the relative number of respondents ticking off a goal is greater if 'level'=1 than if 'level'=0. The correlation between 'level' and each (sub) item is measured by phi-coefficients for 2x2-tables. The p-values refer to Fisher's exact test (one-tailed).

- 'translation into the foreign language' (Q3U11: phi=.15; p=.04)

- 'principles of pronunciation, stress and intonation' (Q3U14: phi=.14; p=.06)

- 'cultural orientation...' (Q3U16: phi=.22; p=.004) - cf. Q1U5.

On the other hand, the content item 'letter writing' is less frequent with 'university study of language' (Q3U9: phi=-.15; p=.04).

4.3 'Level' and 'skills trained by exercises'(Q4)

If the courses have 'university study level', then there is a stronger tendency to train the following skills by means of exercises and assignments (Q4):

- 'grammatical accuracy' (Q4U2: phi=.21; p=.007).

- 'interpretation of literary texts' (Q4U5: phi=.22; p=.004).

- 'correct translation into the foreign language' although this correlation is weak (Q4U9: phi=.13; p=.06)

4.4 'Level' and 'teaching approach'(Q6)

The use of a 'deductive approach' is less frequent at the 'university study level' than at the other level (Q6U2: phi=-.17; p=.03); on the other hand the application of a 'combination of inductive and deductive approaches' occurs more often at the 'university study level ' than at the other level (Q6U3: phi=.20; p=.009).

4.5 'Level' and 'contrastive method' (Q9)

If the courses have 'university study level' then there is a stronger tendency to use a 'contrastive method relating the usage in the foreign language to that in the mother tongue...' (Q9: phi=.25; p=.002).

5 Correlations between Q1 to Q19

The correlations between the (sub)items of Q1 to Q19 are not described here in detail.
The majority of the coefficients (phi) for item inter-correlations have a positive sign indicating a general tendency to concordant responding to the different sub-items.
Correspondingly, factor or cluster analyses of the items show that their relationships can be 'explained' by rather a small number of factor or cluster components - for example: The first five components of a principal component analysis of the 34 sub-items of Q1, Q3 and Q4 'explain' more than 50% of the total variation in the items.

PART III:

Conclusions

Börje Holmberg

Conclusions about the thinking and practice of today's distance educators as to language teaching and learning at a distance

There can be little doubt that the purpose of language study is usually to acquire lingustic proficiency. The present study supports this assumption. Even the respondents who represent pure university teaching pay little attention to knowledge about linguistics and literature, and only to a very limited extent teach systematic phonetics (questions 1 - 3).

In discussions about possible curricula for language teaching and learning there has been much debate about the relative roles of the written and spoken language. It is not unheard of that school curricula give priority to the spoken language (compulsory language teaching in Swedish schools, for example). Against this background it is interesting to see that the vast majority of the distance-teaching organisations answering our questionnaire regard reading and understanding the foreign language as the most important study aim. Listening and understanding comes third among the aims listed, whereas skills in writing are given as the second most important aim. Developing skills in speaking is mentioned as an important aim by a majority of the respondents. The prominence given to reading and understanding nevertheless seems to indicate that the written language is regarded as the most important study object.

This outcome of questions 1 - 2 is to be compared with the replies given to question 3, which concerns the actual content of language courses. The most commonly occurring content item is modern everyday usage, which, if we disregard content items prescribed by examining bodies, is followed by spoken dialogue and principles of pronunciation, stress and intonation rather than, as could have been expected considering the goal declarations, by narrative prose, descriptive prose or systematic grammar, which are given the rank orders 9, 11 and 8 respectively. As priority is given to the written language it is little surprising that translation is given high rank orders, which above all applies to translation from the foreign language; cultural orientation is also a frequently mentioned content item. The frequency of references to

speech in content descriptions is somewhat surprising considering the preponderance of the written language in the goal declarations.

Whether linguistic proficiency should be trained by the study of grammar and principles or by imitation exercises has long been a bone of contention among educators. Attempts to combine the two approaches seem to be common everywhere. Ambivalence in this respect can also be found in the replies given to our questions. Pattern drill (questions 10 - 12) is practised by most respondents, but in a majority of cases this drill is preceded by explanations of the principles governing the usage trained. There can thus be no question of the respondents preferring a wholly imitative method. A combination of the learning of principles (grammar etc.) and imitative practice is evidently preferred.

The skills most frequently mentioned as being <u>trained</u> by the exercises included in the courses (question 4) concern vocabulary, accuracy in grammar and the understanding of the context of texts read. The use of idioms is also given a high-ranking order and, interestingly enough, oral fluency is one of the three most highly ranked skills. Correct pronunciation is mentioned more often than translation as a skill trained. Conversation exercises are included in the courses of most respondents (question 18). Here again there is thus a clear indication that much attention is given to speech although the basic aim is to teach the written language.

The teaching methods used thus seem to be characterised by eclectic approaches. Combinations of inductive and deductive approaches (question 6), translations and word explanations in the foreign language (question 13) are given as preferred choices, which can be mentioned as further evidence of the eclecticism mentioned. Nevertheless clear-cut replies are given on a couple of decisive methodological points: personal teaching style ('in the style of personal letters'; question 7), the use of a contrastive method (question 9), pattern drill (as mentioned; questions 10 - 12) as well as the use of submission assignments as the main form of communication (question 14) are said to be applied in a majority of cases.

In the general debate about the media applicable to distance education modern information technology is given much prominence at present. This does not apply to the present study, however. The most frequently used communication medium (question 17) is the written word (`in writing'). The telephone is evidently also very important, mentioned by no fewer than 104 of the 167 respondents. The media used for the teaching of pronunciation are in most cases audio recordings, while phonetic transcriptions occur in less than one fifth of the replies (question 8). The computer (as in electronic mail, e.g.) is mentioned by only 9 respondents.

Evidently the use of face-to-face contacts also belongs to the media discussion. In fact, there seems to be some hesitation whether foreign languages can be satisfactorily learned entirely at a distance or whether some elements of face-to-face teaching are required (question 19). While 92 respondents find face-to-face sessions disposable, 65 do not think language learning can be satisfactory without them (10 refrained from answering the question).

The study of the correlations between the educational level and the replies given to the questions asked show, as reported on in detail in part 2 above, that universities stress certain aims and skills more than other respondents. Here belong cultural orientation, literary appreciation, linguistics, explanation of principles and contrastive methods, which could have been foreseen, but also translation into the foreign language and grammatical accuracy. What at the first glance appears surprising is that deductive approaches seem to be used less in the university teaching reported on than in teaching at other levels; this is probably an unforeseen consequence of the wording of the question. A combination of deductive and inductive approaches is the preferred choice.

The above indicates some trends in the information collected and reported on in part 2. The data provided must be interpreted against the backgrounds of the wordings of the questions (Appendix I) and the theoretical considerations discussed in part I. It seems important to refer readers back to these

considerations when sifting and judging the applicability of the findings of this study.

A general conclusion of the study is that distance teaching of foreign languages is characterised by a number of different methodological approaches and thus, in this respect, does not differ from language teaching in general. In spite of the preponderance of the written language much attention is given to speech, pronunciation and conversations. Distance teaching of foreign languages - like most teaching of foreign languages - seems to try to combine the advantages of a written approach with those of an oral approach. Apart from the fact that distance education must necessarily mainly rely on non-contiguous communication there appear to be no tangible differences in methodological approach between language teaching at a distance and language teaching using more conventional procedures.

References

Abrioux, D. (1982), Teaching university French from a distance: the student population examined. In Daniel, J., Stroud, M. & Thomsen, J. (eds.), Learning at a distance. A world perspective, pp. 232 - 235

Bloom, B.S. et al. (1956 and 1964), Taxonomy of educational objectives I - II. New York: McKay

Bower, G. H. & Hilgard, E.R. (1981), Theories of learning. Fifth edition. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall

Boyesen, E. (1964), Norsk Korrespondanseskole gjennom 50 år 1914 - 1964. Oslo: NKS

Chomsky, N. (1965), Syntactic structures. The Hague: Mouton

Chomsky, N. (1972), Language and mind. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich

Cook, V.J. (1969), The analogy between first and second language learning. IRAL VII

Forsythe, K. (1986), Understanding the effectiveness of media in the learning process. Paper presented at the World Congress on Education and Technology in Vancouver, May 1986. Victoria: Learning Systems Knowledge Network

Fowler, R. (1974), Understanding language. An introduction to linguistics. London and Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul

Gaddén, G. (1973), Hermods 1898 - 1973. Malmö: Hermods

Gimson, A.C. (1962), An introduction to the pronunciation of English. London: Arnold

Graff, K. & Holmberg, B., eds. (1984), Fernstudium im internationalen Vergleich - Erste Ergebnisse. Hagen: FernUniversität, ZIFF

Graff, K. & Holmberg, B., eds. (1988), International study on distance education: A project report. Hagen: FernUniversität, ZIFF

Holmberg, B. (1978), On strategy and tactics in educational research - plurality but deficient communication. Research in Education 18, pp. 1 - 11

Holmberg, B. (1985), Status and trends of distance education. Second revised edition. Lund: Lector Publishing

Holmberg, B., Schuemer, R. & Obermeier, A. (1982), Zur Effizienz des gelenkten didaktischen Gespräches (with an summary in English). Hagen: FernUniversität, ZIFF

Katz, J.J. (1966), The philosophy of language. New York and London: Harper & Row

Lindell, E. (1970), Behovet av kriterier. In Ellegård, A. & Lindell, E. (eds.), Direkt eller insikt? Lund: Gleerup

Lindell, E. (1971), Främmande språk: grundskolan. Lund: Gleerup

Macdonald-Ross, M. (1973), Behavioural objectives - a critical review. Instructional Science 2, pp. 1 - 52

Malmberg, B. (1971), Språkinlärning. En orientering och ett debattinlägg. Stockholm: Aldus/Bonniers

Rekkedal, T. (1985), Introducing the personal tutor/counsellor in the system of distance education. Project report 2: Final report. Oslo: NKI

Smith, P. & Berger, E. (1965), An assessment of three foreign language teaching strategies utilizing three language laboratory systems. Washington, D.C.: US Department of Health, Education and Welfare

Stringer, M. (1982), Learning French at a distance. The student's perspective. In Daniel, J., Stroud, M. & Thomsen, J. (eds.), Learning at a distance. A world perspective, pp. 236 - 239

Thorén, B. (1957), Mål, medel och metoder vid skolans språk-undervisning. Lund: Gleerup

FERNUNIVERSITÄT
THE DISTANCE STUDY UNIVERSITY
of the Federal Republic of Germany

ZIFF
ZENTRALES INSTITUT FÜR FERNSTUDIENFORSCHUNG
THE INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH INTO DISTANCE EDUCATION

QUESTIONNAIRE ON 'LANGUAGE TEACHING AT A DISTANCE'

F E R N U N I V E R S I T Ä T - G e s a m t h o c h s c h u l e -

Questionnaire to ZIFF-Project 'Language teaching at a distance'

Zentrales Institut für Fernstudienforschung (ZIFF)
Postfach 940
D-5800 Hagen / Federal Republic of Germany

I Address of your institution / of your distance education department

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

II What kind of distance-education organisation is yours?

- ☐ a correspondence school
- ☐ a school teaching both face to face and at a distance
- ☐ a publishing house also offering distance-education courses
- ☐ a broadcasting organisation
- ☐ a distance-teaching university
- ☐ a university teaching both face to face and at a distance
- ☐ other - please specify

.....

.....

III a) Total number of courses offered in distance education only:

b) Number of language courses in distance education only:

IV Educational/training level of your distance education courses in general:

- ☐ basic school education
  (primary and secondary level up to 15/16)
- ☐ further education at school
  (e.g. preparation of 'A' levels, high school certificate and qualification for university studies, upper secondary level)
- ☐ university study, upper college level
- ☐ basic vocational training
- ☐ further vocational training
  (after basic vocational training and/or job experience)
- ☐ others, which? .....

4. Please mark which of the following skills are trained by exercises and assignments in your language teaching at a distance:

___ ☐ oral fluency

___ ☐ grammatical accuracy

___ ☐ free writing

___ ☐ correct pronunciation

___ ☐ interpretation of literary texts

___ ☐ the understanding of the contexts of texts read

___ ☐ vocabulary

___ ☐ correct translation from the foreign language

___ ☐ correct translation into the foreign language

___ ☐ use of idioms typical of the language being studied

5. Please mark in the left-hand margin of question 4 which are the three skills that you give most attention to; please do so by using the numbers 1, 2 and 3.

6. Do you in your teaching of foreign-language usage mainly apply (please tick off):

☐ an inductive approach (by making students observe characteristics of the language, making generalisations and infer rules from observations made)

☐ a deductive approach (teaching rules, from which students can deduct usage)

☐ a combination of inductive and deductive approaches

7. Are your courses in the style of personal letters (referring to the student as 'you', e.g.) or do you use a style resembling that of handbooks?

☐ like letters

☐ like handbooks

8. Do you teach pronunciation, stress and intonation by

☐ descriptions in writing

☐ use of phonetic transcription combined with descriptions

☐ recordings on audio tape/cassette

☐ a systematic combination of all these approaches

Tick off the items that apply.

9. Do you use a contrastive method relating the usage in the foreign language to that in the mother tongue (for example, when dealing with expressions in French like Il demeure ici depuis 1975 explicitly contrasting this with the perfect in English: He has lived here since 1975)?

☐ Yes ☐ No

10. Do you make use of pattern drill (for example by making students answer questions or transform sentences in a prescribed manner, positive into negative etc., as follows: Vous avez des allumettes, madame? (Non, je n'en ai pas) Donnez la lettre à ma femme. (Ne la lui donnez pas)?

☐ Yes ☐ No

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

V At what level do you teach foreign languages?

- ☐ courses for beginners/primary-school level or equivalent for adults
- ☐ secondary-school level
- ☐ university study of language
- ☐ language for occupational use
- ☐ other - please specify

.....

.....

The following questions are concerned exclusively with language learning/teaching at a distance based on pre-produced courses, printed and/or recorded, and on non-contiguous two-way communication, written and/or oral.

1. Please tick off which of the following goals your language courses pursue:

___ ☐ developing skills in reading and understanding

___ ☐ developing skills in listening and understanding

___ ☐ developing skills in writing

___ ☐ developing skills in speaking

___ ☐ orienting students in the culture/s/ the language represents

___ ☐ promoting literary appreciation

___ ☐ promoting factual knowledge of literature

___ ☐ promoting knowledge about linguistics

Is there any other goal? If so, which? .....

2. Please note in the left-hand margin of question 1 which are the three most important goals; please do so by using the numbers 1, 2 and 3 (1 for the most important goal, 2 and 3 for the goals to which you give second and third priority).

3. Which of the following content items are included in your language courses? Please tick off.

- ☐ contents prescribed in school or university curricula
- ☐ modern everyday usage
- ☐ narrative prose - extract from novels, e.g.
- ☐ descriptive prose - as in reports of various kinds
- ☐ argumentative prose - as in debates and polemics
- ☐ poetry
- ☐ drama
- ☐ spoken dialogue
- ☐ letter writing
- ☐ translation from the foreign language
- ☐ translation into the foreign language
- ☐ selected principles of grammar
- ☐ systematic grammar
- ☐ principles of pronunciation, stress and intonation
- ☐ systematic phonetics
- ☐ cultural orientation, e.g. constitution/social conditions/press/traditions and habits of the culture/s/ of the language

11. If the answer to 10 is yes, are the principles governing the usage explained in detail in advance?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Or in connection with or after the exercise?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Or do you wholly rely on imitation and refrain from theoretical explanations?

☐ Yes ☐ No

12. Are these pattern exercises performed in writing

☐ Yes ☐ No

- or on audio cassettes/tapes?

☐ Yes ☐ No

13. Is it your practice to provide translations of new words used?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Or do you replace translations by explanations in the foreign language?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Or do you use both procedures as found appropriate in each individual case?

☐ Yes ☐ No

14. Is the non-contiguous communication between the students and your organisation primarily based on assignments for submission, correction and comment?

☐ Yes ☐ No

15. If the answer to 14 is yes, do the assignments include questions on pronunciation, stress and intonation?

☐ Yes ☐ No

16. If the answer to 14 is no, please explain what type of non-contiguous communication occurs and how it is brought about:

.....

.....

.....

17. Do students taking your language courses communicate with your organisation (please tick off)

☐ in writing

☐ on the telephone

☐ on audio cassettes/tapes

☐ by computer

18. Do your courses include conversation exercises?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If the answer is yes, please explain your procedure.

.....

.....

.....

19. Can in your experience the learning of modern languages at a distance be satisfactory without any elements whatsoever of face-to-face teaching?

☐ Yes ☐ No

20. If the answer to 19 is no, for what part/s/ of language learning do you find face-to-face teaching indispensable?

.....

.....

.....

If you feel like it add here and/or on a separate sheet any further comment you would like to make on the basis of your experience of language teaching at a distance.

Please return this form duly filled in to

Professor Dr.Dr.h.c. Börje Holmberg
FernUniversität - Gesamthochschule -
Zentrales Institut für Fernstudienforschung (ZIFF)
Postfach 940
D-5800 Hagen 1
West Germany

Cross-tabs: 'Teaching level' x Q1-Q9

Each table consists of the 2 levels in the rows ('level'=1 "university study" / 'level'=0 "others") and one of the (sub)items of question 1 to 9 in the columns. The number preceded by "Q" is the question number and the number preceded by "U" is the number of the subitem. Each cell of the tables consists (from top to bottom): a) the observed frequency, b) the expected frequency, c) the deviation (between a) and b)), and d) the row percent.

TABLE OF 'level' BY Q1U3

FREQUENCY! EXPECTED ! DEVIATION! ROW PCT !	0!	1!	TOTAL
0 !	19 !	68 !	87
	14.7 !	72.3 !	
	4.3 !	-4.3 !	
	21.84 !	78.16 !	
1 !	9 !	70 !	79
	13.3 !	65.7 !	
	-4.3 !	4.3 !	
	11.39 !	88.61 !	
TOTAL	28	138	166

FREQUENCY MISSING = 1

TABLE OF 'level' BY Q1U5

FREQUENCY! EXPECTED ! DEVIATION! ROW PCT !	0!	1!	TOTAL
0 !	41 !	46 !	87
	34.1 !	52.9 !	
	6.9 !	-6.9 !	
	47.13 !	52.87 !	
1 !	24 !	55 !	79
	30.9 !	48.1 !	
	-6.9 !	6.9 !	
	30.38 !	69.62 !	
TOTAL	65	101	166

FREQUENCY MISSING = 1

Appendix 2: Cross-tabs: 'Teaching level' x Q1-Q9 / 2

TABLE OF 'level' BY Q1U6

FREQUENCY! EXPECTED ! DEVIATION! ROW PCT !	0!	1!	TOTAL
0	58	29	87
	47.7	39.3	
	10.3	-10.3	
	66.67	33.33	
1	33	46	79
	43.3	35.7	
	-10.3	10.3	
	41.77	58.23	
TOTAL	91	75	166

FREQUENCY MISSING = 1

TABLE OF 'level' BY Q1U7

FREQUENCY! EXPECTED ! DEVIATION! ROW PCT !	0!	1!	TOTAL
0	63	24	87
	58.7	28.3	
	4.3	-4.3	
	72.41	27.59	
1	49	30	79
	53.3	25.7	
	-4.3	4.3	
	62.03	37.97	
TOTAL	112	54	166

FREQUENCY MISSING = 1

Appendix 2: Cross-tabs: 'Teaching level' x Q1-Q9 / 3

TABLE OF 'level' BY Q1U8

FREQUENCY! EXPECTED ! DEVIATION! ROW PCT !	0!	1!	TOTAL
0	75	12	87
	68.7	18.3	
	6.3	-6.3	
	86.21	13.79	
1	56	23	79
	62.3	16.7	
	-6.3	6.3	
	70.89	29.11	
TOTAL	131	35	166

FREQUENCY MISSING = 1

TABLE OF 'level' BY Q3U1

FREQUENCY! EXPECTED ! DEVIATION! ROW PCT !	0!	1!	TOTAL
0	43	42	85
	31.9	53.1	
	11.1	-11.1	
	50.59	49.41	
1	19	61	80
	30.1	49.9	
	-11.1	11.1	
	23.75	76.25	
TOTAL	62	103	165

FREQUENCY MISSING = 2

Appendix 2: Cross-tabs: 'Teaching level' x Q1-Q9 / 4

TABLE OF 'level' BY Q3U3

FREQUENCY! EXPECTED ! DEVIATION! ROW PCT !	0!	1!	TOTAL
0	48	38	86
	40.4	45.6	
	7.6	-7.6	
	55.81	44.19	
1	30	50	80
	37.6	42.4	
	-7.6	7.6	
	37.50	62.50	
TOTAL	78	88	166

FREQUENCY MISSING = 1

TABLE OF 'level' BY Q3U6

FREQUENCY! EXPECTED ! DEVIATION! ROW PCT !	0!	1!	TOTAL
0	58	27	85
	52.5	32.5	
	5.5	-5.5	
	68.24	31.76	
1	44	36	80
	49.5	30.5	
	-5.5	5.5	
	55.00	45.00	
TOTAL	102	63	165

FREQUENCY MISSING = 2

Appendix 2: Cross-tabs: 'Teaching level' x Q1-Q9 / 5

TABLE OF 'level' BY Q3U7

FREQUENCY / EXPECTED / DEVIATION / ROW PCT	0	1	TOTAL
0	68	18	86
	57.5	28.5	
	10.5	-10.5	
	79.07	20.93	
1	43	37	80
	53.5	26.5	
	-10.5	10.5	
	53.75	46.25	
TOTAL	111	55	166

FREQUENCY MISSING = 1

TABLE OF 'level' BY Q3U9

FREQUENCY / EXPECTED / DEVIATION / ROW PCT	0	1	TOTAL
0	37	48	85
	43.3	41.7	
	-6.3	6.3	
	43.53	56.47	
1	47	33	80
	40.7	39.3	
	6.3	-6.3	
	58.75	41.25	
TOTAL	84	81	165

FREQUENCY MISSING = 2

Appendix 2: Cross-tabs: 'Teaching level' x Q1-Q9 / 6

TABLE OF 'level' BY Q3U11

FREQUENCY! EXPECTED ! DEVIATION! ROW PCT !	0!	1!	TOTAL
0	40	45	85
	34.0	51.0	
	6.0	-6.0	
	47.06	52.94	
1	26	54	80
	32.0	48.0	
	-6.0	6.0	
	32.50	67.50	
TOTAL	66	99	165

FREQUENCY MISSING = 2

TABLE OF 'level' BY Q3U14

FREQUENCY! EXPECTED ! DEVIATION! ROW PCT !	0!	1!	TOTAL
0	32	53	85
	26.8	58.2	
	5.2	-5.2	
	37.65	62.35	
1	20	60	80
	25.2	54.8	
	-5.2	5.2	
	25.00	75.00	
TOTAL	52	113	165

FREQUENCY MISSING = 2

Appendix 2: Cross-tabs: 'Teaching level' x Q1-Q9 / 7

TABLE OF 'level' BY Q3U16

FREQUENCY! EXPECTED ! DEVIATION! ROW PCT !	0!	1!	TOTAL
0	40	45	85
	31.4	53.6	
	8.6	-8.6	
	47.06	52.94	
1	21	59	80
	29.6	50.4	
	-8.6	8.6	
	26.25	73.75	
TOTAL	61	104	165

FREQUENCY MISSING = 2

TABLE OF 'level' BY Q4U2

FREQUENCY! EXPECTED ! DEVIATION! ROW PCT !	0!	1!	TOTAL
0	16	70	86
	10.4	75.6	
	5.6	-5.6	
	18.60	81.40	
1	4	75	79
	9.6	69.4	
	-5.6	5.6	
	5.06	94.94	
TOTAL	20	145	165

FREQUENCY MISSING = 2

Appendix 2: Cross-tabs: 'Teaching level' x Q1-Q9 / 8

TABLE OF 'level' BY Q4U5

FREQUENCY! EXPECTED ! DEVIATION! ROW PCT !	0!	1!	TOTAL
0 !	61 !	25 !	86
	52.1 !	33.9 !	
	8.9 !	-8.9 !	
	70.93 !	29.07 !	
1 !	39 !	40 !	79
	47.9 !	31.1 !	
	-8.9 !	8.9 !	
	49.37 !	50.63 !	
TOTAL	100	65	165

FREQUENCY MISSING = 2

TABLE OF 'level' BY Q4U9

FREQUENCY! EXPECTED ! DEVIATION! ROW PCT !	0!	1!	TOTAL
0 !	40 !	46 !	86
	34.6 !	51.4 !	
	5.4 !	-5.4 !	
	46.51 !	53.49 !	
1 !	26 !	52 !	78
	31.4 !	46.6 !	
	-5.4 !	5.4 !	
	33.33 !	66.67 !	
TOTAL	66	98	164

FREQUENCY MISSING = 3

Appendix 2: Cross-tabs: 'Teaching level' x Q1-Q9 / 9

TABLE OF 'level' BY Q6U2

FREQUENCY / EXPECTED / DEVIATION / ROW PCT	0	1	TOTAL
0	67	18	85
	72.0	13.0	
	-5.0	5.0	
	78.82	21.18	
1	71	7	78
	66.0	12.0	
	5.0	-5.0	
	91.03	8.97	
TOTAL	138	25	163

FREQUENCY MISSING = 4

TABLE OF 'level' BY Q6U3

FREQUENCY / EXPECTED / DEVIATION / ROW PCT	0	1	TOTAL
0	29	56	85
	21.9	63.1	
	7.1	-7.1	
	34.12	65.88	
1	13	65	78
	20.1	57.9	
	-7.1	7.1	
	16.67	83.33	
TOTAL	42	121	163

FREQUENCY MISSING = 4

Appendix 2: Cross-tabs: 'Teaching level' x Q1-Q9 / 10

TABLE OF 'level' BY Q9

FREQUENCY! EXPECTED ! DEVIATION! ROW PCT !	0!	1!	TOTAL
0 !	33 !	44 !	77
!	24.3 !	52.7 !	
!	8.7 !	-8.7 !	
!	42.86 !	57.14 !	
1 !	15 !	60 !	75
!	23.7 !	51.3 !	
!	-8.7 !	8.7 !	
!	20.00 !	80.00 !	
TOTAL	48	104	152

FREQUENCY MISSING = 15